



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/647,963 | 08/26/2003 | Martin Lund | 14222US02 | 5243 |
| 23446 7590 05/11/2010 MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD 500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL 60661 | | | | |
| EXAMINER BARQADEL, YASIN M | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2456 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 05/11/2010 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/647,963

Applicant(s)

LUND, MARTIN

Examiner

YASIN BARQADLE

Art Unit

2456

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed on January 21, 2010 has been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive.

- Claims 1-15 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

In essence the Applicant argues that “it appears the Office Action is alleging that McGraw's link card/board is a switch blade; however, nowhere in McGraw is there any disclosure regarding McGraw's link card/board performing any switching functions. Rather, McGraw describes its link card/board as a network interface card or bridge (McGraw, Paragraph [0128]), which is different than a switch blade.... McGraw's link card/board is merely an interface between inter-chassis and local buses, which is different than a switch blade.”
Page 6, second paragraph.

The Examiner disagrees. For example Applicant's specification states “The switch blade 140 may be part of the backplane 130. In this regard, the switch blade 140 may be integrated within the backplane 130 or it may be a plug-in card that may be plugged into the backplane 130.” [0029]. The specification also states that “Furthermore, the backplane 130 and/or the switch blades 140 may provide connectivity between the one or more of the blade servers 120 and the network 170.” [0031]. Therefore, McGraw's link card/board is similar in

hardware (plug-in card) and function (provide connectivity between blade server and a network). See figure 7 and paragraphs [0128-0131]. As such in light of the Applicant's disclosure McGraw's Link card/board meets the broadest reasonable interpretation of switch blade and/or switch.

Furthermore, "The link card entity is a bridge between multiple chassis and is involved in proxy of commands on behalf of console server 50." (128). In other words it also provides a switching functionality between multiple chassis.

In response to Applicant's argument in page 9 second paragraph "Further, even if McGraw's link cards/boards could be considered switch blades (which they clearly are not), the Applicant notes that nowhere in McGraw is there any disclosure regarding a central switch coupled to one or more of the switch blades of the multiserver platforms. Rather, each of McGraw's link cards/boards is part of a chassis having a plurality of blades. (See e.g., McGraw, Figure 7). Thus, McGraw clearly fails to teach a central switch as set forth in dependent claims 2-3, 6-7 mad 13- 15." Page 9 second paragraph.

The Examiner disagrees. In light of the explanation above and link card/boards shown in figure 7 and particularly the middle link board is interpreted as the central switch that interconnects between the above chassis with the lower chassis via link boards.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McGraw et al (US Publication. 20020188718), hereinafter "McGraw"

As per claims 1 and 5, McGraw teaches a method and a machine readable storage for communicating information in a server platform (see fig. 1 and 7), the method comprising:

receiving at least one packet from at least one of a first switch blade associated with a first multiserver platform (Fig. 1 and fig. 7; 0128-00131);

determining at least a server blade associated with a second multiserver platform for receiving at least a portion of said received at least one packet (see fig. 7; ¶ 0138-00144; 0159-161); and

routing said at least a portion of said at least one received packet to at least said server blade (¶ 0138-00144; 0159-161).

As per claims 2 and 6, McGraw teaches the invention, wherein said receiving

further comprises receiving said at least one packet by at least one of a second switch blade associated with a third multiserver platform and a central switch (¶ 0138-00144; 0159-161).

As per claims 3 and 7, McGraw teaches the invention, further comprising if said at least one packet is received by said central switch, communicating said at least a portion of said at least one received packet to at least said second switch blade via at least one communication link that couples said central switch directly to said at least said second switch blade (see fig. 7; ¶ 0138-00144; 0159-161).

As per claim 4, McGraw teaches the method according to claim 1, further comprising processing said routed at least a portion of said at least one received packet by said at least said second blade server (¶ 0138-00144; 0159-161).

As per claim 8, McGraw teaches the machine-readable storage according to claim 5, further comprising code for processing said routed at least a portion of said at least one received packet by said at least said second blade server (¶ 0138-00144; 0159-161).

As per claims 9 and 10, McGraw teaches a system for communicating

information in a server platform, the system comprising: a first multiserver platform comprising at least one of a network interface and a first switch blade (see fig. 1 and fig. 7 ¶ 0138-00144); and

at least a second multiserver platform comprising a second switch blade coupled said first switch blade of said first multiserver platform (see fig. 1 and fig. 7; ¶ 0138-00144; 0159-161).

As per claim 11, McGraw teaches the system according to claim 10, wherein said first multiserver platform, said second multiserver platform and said third multiserver are coupled in a daisy-chain configuration (see fig. 7).

As per claim 12, McGraw teaches according to claim 10, wherein said first multiserver platform, and said third multiserver platform communicate via said second multiserver platform (see fig. 1 and fig. 7; ¶ 0138-00144; 0159-0161).

As per claim 13, McGraw teaches the system according to claim 9, further comprising at least one central switch coupled to at least said first switch blade of said first multiserver platform and said second switch blade of said second multiserver platform (see fig. 1 and fig. 7; ¶ 0138-00144; 0159-0161).

As per claim 14, McGraw teaches the system according to claim 13, further comprising at least a third switch blade of a third multiserver platform coupled

to said at least one central switch (see fig. 1 and fig. 7; ¶ 0138-00144; 0159-0161).

As per claim 15, McGraw teaches the system according to claim 14, wherein said first multiserver platform, said second multiserver platform and said third multiserver platform communicate via said central switch (see fig. 1 and fig. 7; ¶ 0138-00144; 0159-0161).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yasin Barqadle whose telephone number is 571-272-3947. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dharia Rupal can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Yasin M Barqadle/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2456

